REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action dated July 13, 2007, Claims 1-53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §
103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0131957 to
Watkinson ("Watkinson") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,671,436 to Morris et al. ("Morris").
Applicants appreciate Examiner taking the time to grant the telephonic interview of October 19,
2007. As an initial matter, claims that formerly recited a "web server application" have been
amended to recite a web server as per Examiner's suggestion in the telephonic interview. As
explained below, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention of independent
Claims 1, 14, 25, 34, and 43, and by dependency Claims 2-13, 15-24, 26-33, 35-42, 44-49 and
50-53 are patentably distinct from the cited references, viewed alone or in combination. As such,
Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the pending claims of the
present application.

Independent Claims 1, 14, 25, 34, and 43

Amended independent Claims 1, 14, 25, and 43 of the present application generally
recite, amongst other things, that the mobile terminal executes a web server that provides for a
remote network device to access the mobile terminal via a network connection. Specifically,
independent Claim 1 recites a "mobile terminal apparatus . . . comprising . . . a web server."
Independent Claim 14 recites "providing a mobile terminal that implements a web server,"
"initiating a web browser application at a remote network device," and "accessing, at the remote
network device, the mobile terminal via a network connection to the web server of the mobile
terminal." Independent Claim 25 recites "a web server executed by the mobile terminal."
Independent Claim 43 recites "a mobile terminal including a first data processing device that
executes a web server" and "a remote network device including a second data processor device
that executes a web browser application that provides access to the web server of the mobile
terminal." Although independent Claim 34 does not specifically recite a "web server," Claim 34
is directed to such an application that is capable of providing a remote network device access to a

mobile terminal, and of providing the accessed remote network device functional access to one or more devices associated with the mobile terminal.

The Office Action admits that Watkinson does not disclose a web server application that provides for a remote network device to access the mobile terminal via a wireless communication link. However, the Examiner posits that Morris does disclose a web server application that provides for a remote network device to access the mobile terminal via a wireless communication, citing column 4, lines 52-67 and column 9 lines 10-25 of Morris. Applicants submit, however, that Morris does not disclose a web server application that provides for a remote network device to access a mobile terminal. Morris, instead, discloses a distributive computing system whereby mobile terminals formulate SQL requests to a database server for currently needed portions of databases and applications. *See, e.g.,* Col. 7, lines 28-60. Morris discloses that "[m]uch of the data and software to be used by the terminals need not be stored within the terminal's memory, but rather may reside in the database server 130 or in the memory of the host computer 118." Col. 7, lines 61-64. Only when the mobile terminal needs a particular data set or software does it then receive the requested data or software from the database server after formulating a SQL request. As the Morris disclosure further opines:

> It is a significant aspect of this invention, that not all of the application programs or application specific data which may be used by a terminal 112, should be stored in the SRAM 146, but rather that significant portions of the application programs and specific data may be stored in the database server 130 to be accessed when needed by a particular terminal 112. (Col. 9, lines 24-31)

> [T]he SRAM 146 of a portable data collection terminal 112 is significantly smaller than the disk drive 137 of a database server 130 and may have a capacity insufficient to store all of an application program and data to be executed by its microprocessor. (Col. 10, lines 50-54)

Thus, Morris not only does not disclose a web server residing on a mobile terminal allowing for remote network devices to access data and applications stored on the mobile terminal, but also teaches that the mobile terminal accesses limited subsets of data and applications stored on a remote server by communicating with the server via SQL requests so as to not waste limited memory on the mobile terminal. In stark contrast, the claimed invention of the current application discloses maintaining databases and applications in their entirety on a mobile

terminal running a web server, which allows remote network devices to access and utilize the databases, applications, and devices of a mobile terminal when, for example, the mobile terminal user does not currently have the mobile terminal in his possession. *See, e.g.,* Page 3, line 14-Page 5, line 2. Therefore, Morris implicitly, if not explicitly, teaches away from the claimed invention of the current application.

Therefore, since neither cited reference discloses a mobile terminal having a web server that provides a remote device with access to the mobile terminal (or devices associated with the mobile terminal), no combination of the cited references discloses a mobile terminal having such a web server. Thus independent Claims 1, 14, 25, 34, and 43 are patentably distinct over the cited references, taken alone or in combination, and in condition for allowance. Since each dependent claim includes all of the recitations of a respective independent claim, Applicants submit that all of the dependent claims are as well patentably distinct over the cited references taken alone or in combination for at least the reasons discussed above as well as the below arguments with respect to certain dependent claims.

Dependent Claims 6, 18, 21-24, 39-42, and 46

These dependent claims all generally recite accessing devices associated with the mobile terminal from a remote network device. These devices may include, for example, a telephone, camera, video recording device, GPS receiver, or audio recording device. The Office Action posits that Watkinson discloses that the content engine application provides for functional access by the remote network device to one or more <u>mobile terminal devices</u>. Applicants submit that paragraph 24 in particular, as well as other paragraphs of Watkinson cited by the Office Action, does not teach or disclose allowing a remote network device to access one or more devices associated with the mobile terminal, but rather merely discloses remotely accessing databases. Thus Applicants submit that Claims 6, 18, 21-24, 39-42, and 46 are patentably distinct over the cited references taken alone or in combination.

Dependent Claims 27, 29-30, and 32

The Office Action states that Col. 10, lines 50-56 of Morris discloses the recitation of

Claim 27 wherein managing the mobile terminal includes accessing the applications associated

with the mobile terminal to provide diagnostic analysis to the mobile terminal, as well as the

recitations of dependent Claims 29-30 and 32 which claim monitoring various aspects of mobile

terminal performance. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portion of Morris discusses

the benefits of the previously described distributive processing system taught by Morris with

regard to optimizing the use of limited mobile terminal memory and does not teach or disclose

providing diagnostic analysis to the mobile terminal by remotely accessing applications

associated with the mobile terminal or monitoring performance of the mobile terminal. Thus the

recitations of Claims 27, 29-30 and 32 are patentably distinct from the cited prior art taken alone,

or in combination.

Dependent Claim 28

The Office Action states that Col. 13, lines 1-6 of Morris discloses the step of debugging

the mobile terminal by tracing data communicated from the mobile terminal. Applicants submit,

however, that Morris does not teach or disclose debugging the mobile terminal, but rather only

relates a time out period in which a device stops waiting for a response after the passage of 30

seconds from the time of request and generates an error message. Applicants thus argue that the

time out mechanism taught by Morris does not render obvious actual debugging of the mobile

terminal as claimed by Claim 28 and thus Claim 28 is patentably distinct over the cited

references taken alone or in combination.

In light of the foregoing arguments and amendments patentably distinguishing the claims

over the cited references taken alone or in combination, Applicants respectfully submit that the

current rejections are overcome and the claims are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks and amendments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that the claims of the present application are in condition for allowance. It is respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued in due course. The Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present application.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles A. Leyes
Registration No. 36,898

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON November 27, 2007.

LEGAL02/30122888v1